



2018-2019 Mid-Term Credibility Plan Review

PI: C. Alberto Figueroa

#	Ten Simple Rules	REVIEWER #1		REVIEWER #2	
		Considered in the Credibility Plan?	Comments	Considered in the Credibility Plan?	Comments
1	Define context clearly	sufficient	It would also be helpful to know if the model is intended for research (e.g., hypothesis generation) or clinical (e.g., use to determine treatment for patients)		
2	Use appropriate data	insufficient	What was provided was very useful. The one critical missing piece was listing the source of the measurement (e.g., which come from MRI vs. pressure) in Table 1. Also, it's not clear to me how you go from pressure, flow, velocity to collagen mass production, turnover rate, etc.		
3	Evaluate within context	sufficient	Great job describing the current validation that has been done. It would be more appropriate to list the verification and uncertainty quantification text you have under "competing implementations" here.		
4	List limitations explicitly	sufficient			
5	Use version control	sufficient	CRIMSON software shared via Bitbucket repository. It wasn't clear that the model framework being developed is part of the CRIMSON software, but am giving the investigators the benefit of the doubt		
6	Document adequately	insufficient	Missing documentation to help users and developer use the framework		
7	Disseminate broadly	insufficient	Should also mention the availability of the framework on Bitbucket here. Will data and simulation results also be shared through Bitbucket?		
8	Get independent reviews	insufficient	Mentions research and clinical collaborations and regular meetings, but unclear if this qualifies as review by "nonpartisan third-party user"		
9	Test competing implementations	sufficient			
10	Conform to standards	N/A - insufficient	It is unknown what standards exist. What is expected here is reference to standard input file formats, guidelines provided by documents such as "Considerations for reporting finite element analysis studies in biomechanics" by Erdemir, etc		

General Comments

Reviewer 1:

The project has established some rigorous credibility practices. There are a few areas where the project could further bolster the credibility of the model being developed. See comments above.